

train service. From the outset, it was clear that the task of revitalizing the service would be daunting. Amtrak had to overcome years of railroad neglect and indifference.

The first thing that Amtrak had to do was to arrest the long-term decline in intercity rail passenger ridership. Despite being woefully undercapitalized and inheriting a fleet of passenger cars and locomotives that averaged more than 20 years old, Amtrak stemmed the tide of traffic to the other modes and began the long and arduous task of rebuilding passenger train service in America.

Over the years, Amtrak has managed to replace and upgrade the car and locomotive fleets, rehabilitate many once dilapidated train stations, and introduce a variety of new services in an effort to keep people riding the rails. Congress has continued to provide both operating, and capital support for Amtrak, although the level of support has varied. Amtrak has never received the kind public investment that the Nation's highways and aviation system's have received. In fact, the Corporation often has been starved for capital. Almost from the outset, Amtrak's opponents have pressured Amtrak to reduce its deficits, while at the same time they tried to cut its budget. From Roger Lewis to George Warrington, a succession of Amtrak's CEOs have pleaded for adequate funding. Rarely have those pleas been answered.

Nevertheless, many in the Congress have demanded that subsidies to Amtrak be eliminated, and the Corporation is now scheduled to achieve operating self sufficiency by the end of 2002. Amtrak has made great progress toward reaching that goal.

Back in 1971, many believed that Amtrak would be little more than a holding action until passenger trains disappeared forever. Instead, despite the obstacles, Amtrak has survived—survived the inadequate equipment and facilities with which it started life; survived the budget cutters, and survived the competition from low cost airlines. And now, in 2001, we see the wisdom of keeping in place intercity rail passenger service in the United States.

Today, our airports and highways are facing gridlock. Delays are rampant and there are real limits to simply pouring more concrete and asphalt for new highways and runways to solve our Nation's congestion problems. Intercity rail passenger service can now be a major part of the solution to our transportation congestion problems. Most recently, Amtrak has inaugurated its Acela train service in the Northeast Corridor, and for the first time Americans can experience high-speed rail travel similar to what the French, Germans, and Japanese have enjoyed for decades.

When the Acela trains are fully operational, Amtrak plans to capture 50 percent of the air-rail travel market in the Northeast Corridor, replicating its experience in the southern end of the Corridor between New York and Washington D.C. with its Metroliner service. Already, Amtrak is carrying a record number of passengers—22.5 million in 2000—and, as additional Acela trains come on line, Amtrak's ridership will increase further. Amtrak should be proud of what it has achieved.

In the near future, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON) and I will be introducing a bill that will help develop high-speed rail

passenger service throughout the United States. The Secretary of Transportation has designated about a dozen high-speed rail corridors around the Nation that will be eligible for this funding. Amtrak currently serves these corridors, and in most cases its operations will provide the basis for building the high-speed operations.

By preserving our Nation's rail passenger service network through difficult times, Amtrak has set the stage for developing a national network of high-speed trains that can play a major role in relieving air and highway traffic congestion. Not only then is Amtrak a vital link to our Nation's transportation history, it is indispensable to our transportation future.

ON PRESIDENT BUSH'S EDUCATION PROPOSAL

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 2001

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues an outstanding article written by Linda Banas, an English teacher, a constituent, and a resident of Tonawanda, New York, regarding President Bush's education proposal. This article, which appeared in the April 24, 2001 edition of the Buffalo News, is response to the President's recent statements on National Public Radio that our children are trapped in schools that do not teach and will not change. Linda Banas's column appropriately points out that these accusations are groundless. She emphasizes that teachers across Western New York and throughout the nation are making extra efforts to ensure their students succeed both in and outside the classroom. Her thoughtful ideas and observations serve as a starting point from which to begin a national conversation on education, and I urge all of my colleagues to take the time to read the following article.

MY VIEW: BUSH'S INANE ACCUSATIONS WON'T IMPROVE OUR SCHOOLS

I am a teacher. I teach in a nice suburban high school. We have access to the Internet in every classroom. Most of the students go on to post-secondary education. The halls are calm and the students are polite and thoughtful.

Our district is not without problems, but we can handle them because the community has resources. I am truly thankful for the opportunity I have to focus on what I was trained to do—teach English. As I drive to work, I listen to National Public Radio. Recently, President Bush was talking about education. He said, "... children are trapped in schools that will not teach and will not change."

I tried to imagine the teachers and administrators the president says will not teach. I suppose Bush pictures them sifting around tables having morning coffee and planning their day. A kindergarten teacher would snicker as she says, "I know the whole alphabet, but I am not going to tell even one letter to those kids in my room." A second grade teacher would agree, "I know how to do long division, but I'm not going to teach them how to even do the first step."

Bush wants to be the education president. Does he really think some educators go to

school to not teach? I know of a high school where the one set of books is chained to the desks so the kids cannot take them home to study. Why doesn't the president know this?

I know a school librarian who spends part of her paycheck on coats and shoes for children who don't have any, teaches gang members to write poetry, runs baby showers for young mothers who have nothing, and buys food every week for kids who are hungry after school. Why doesn't the president know this?

I know a teacher of eighth-grade English who has no novels and is allowed one ream of paper a month for her 160 students. I know about the hundreds of dollars she spends in the copy stores each year. I know a guidance counselor who takes children into her home to help them escape abuse and hunger. Why doesn't Bush know this?

If I were the education president, I would look at these teachers and the thousands like them who "will not teach." I would look at the neighborhoods around the schools. I would see great poverty and need amidst the plenty and prosperity. If I were the education president, I would wonder why all children do not have clean, warm, well equipped schools.

If I were the education president, I would ask Congress to provide each child with a school as nice as the ones my daughters attended. That would be a start. Then I would ask how we could improve the neighborhoods where these children live.

If I were the education president, I would wonder what I could do to help poor parents get training or better jobs. If I were the education president, I would see that every neighborhood had access to a clinic and that all children had enough to eat. After I did all these things, then I would be certain to hold schools accountable for the children in their charge.

A real education president will use his power to make positive change in the lives of our children. A real education president will not settle for accusations and trite sayings. If I could spend an hour with this education president, I would beg him to spend some time with teachers in the schools he says "will not teach." Then I would ask him to rise above partisanship and make a real difference.

UNBORN VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE ACT OF 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 2001

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this misguided bill.

Let me make something perfectly clear from the outset: The loss or harm to a woman and her fetus is absolutely devastating to the woman and her family. Those who injure or kill a pregnant woman and her fetus should be severely punished, and families should have the legal tools to have their loss recognized. We will offer a substitute that does that, and I believe that the Lofgren substitute demonstrates very clearly that there is a lot of common ground on this issue if we would only look for that instead of looking for ways to disagree.

Having said that, let me explain why the approach this bill takes is just another thinly veiled attack on a woman's right to choose.

This bill would give a fetus the same legal recognition as you or I—for the first time in federal law. Instead of addressing the real issues at hand—the horrible pain for a woman who loses a pregnancy to a cowardly, violent act—this bill is an ideological marker for the anti-choice special interests.

Frankly, this bill is just another way of writing a Human Life Amendment. In fact, the National Right to Life Committee admits that it participated in the drafting of the bill, and according to the NRTL website, “[t]he bill challenges that [pro-choice] ideology by recognizing the unborn child as a human victim, distinct from the mother.”

If anti-choice members of this House want to recognize the fetus as a person—do that. Put your money where your mouth is. Bring a Human Life Amendment to the floor and let us vote on it. But don't tell pregnant women in this country that you're trying to protect them with this bill when there are existing state and federal laws to do that and when we are willing to join you in addressing the tragic cases when pregnant women are attacked. The American people are smarter than you're giving them credit for. They know that you're proposing a political statement today, not a real solution.

If you really want to crack down on cowardly criminals who would attack a pregnant woman, support the Lofgren substitute. It gets us to the same ends, without the overtly political means. And if you're serious about protecting women in this country from violence, let's fully fund the Violence Against Women Act today.

VAWA is the most effective way for us to help combat violence against women. Every year, over two million American women are physically abused by their husbands or boyfriends. A woman is physically abused every 15 seconds in this country. And one of every three abused children becomes an adult abuser or victim. The Unborn Victims of Violence Act will do nothing for these women. But VAWA makes all the difference in the world.

My colleagues, please do not be fooled. The Unborn Victims of Violence Act is not about protecting pregnant women from violent acts. Rather, it is yet another anti-choice attempt to undermine a woman's right to choose.

I have stood on the House floor many times and asked my colleagues to work with me to find ways to help women improve their health, plan their pregnancies, and have healthier children. It is tragic that every day over 400 babies are born to mothers who received little or no prenatal care, every minute a baby is born to a teen mother, and three babies die every hour. And it is tragic that 1 of every 3 women will experience domestic violence in her adulthood.

Instead of finding new ways to revisit the divisive abortion battle, Americans want us to focus our efforts on providing women with access to prenatal care, affordable contraception, health education and violence prevention. If we truly want to protect women and their pregnancies from harm, then let us work together to enact legislation to help women have healthy babies and protect them from violent abusers.

Please vote no on H.R. 503.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN HONOR OF DORIS MERRILL
MAGOWAN

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 2001

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a prominent and beloved San Franciscan, Doris Merrill Magowan. Mrs. Magowan recently passed away, and she will be missed not only in San Francisco, a City she called home, but across the country.

San Francisco had to share Mrs. Magowan with several other cities, and each benefited from its association with her. Mrs. Magowan divided her time among California, New York, and Florida and was an active member of her community in every location. In San Francisco, she served on the Board of Directors of the Fine Arts Museum, the Strybing Arboretum, Children's Hospital, and Grace Cathedral Episcopal Church. A lover of art, gardens, and antiques, she founded the San Francisco Antique Show in 1979. The event has become one of the premier events in the field.

In New York City, she served on the Board of the Greenwich House, the Lenox Hill Neighborhood Association, and the New York Infirmary. In South Hampton, New York, she worked with the Fresh Air Home, St. Andrews Dune Church, and South Hampton Hospital. In Palm Beach, Florida, she served with the society of the Four Arts and Bethesda-by-the-Sea.

Nationally and internationally, she was involved with the National Tropical Botanical Garden, the World Wildlife Fund, the Smithsonian Institution, and the Most Venerable Order of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem.

Family was of great importance to Doris Magowan, and her family members were as impressive as she was. Her father, Charles Edward Merrill, founded the financial services company Merrill Lynch. Her brother, James Ingram Merrill, was a Pulitzer Prize winning poet. Her brother, Charles Edward Merrill, served as the President of Morehouse College in Atlanta. Her husband, Robert Anderson Magowan, was Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of the Safeway grocery store company.

She also leaves five successful sons, Robin, Merrill, Peter, Stephen, and Mark. It has been my privilege to know this exceptional family, including Peter in his capacity as President and Managing General Partner of the San Francisco Giants.

Doris Magowan was an inspiration and a friend to many. Her commitment to her community and her family earned her the respect and admiration of all who knew her. My thoughts and prayers are with her sons, her grandchildren, and her great grandchildren at this sad time.

May 1, 2001

INTRODUCTION OF INDIAN
HEALTH CARE IMPROVEMENT
ACT REAUTHORIZATION

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 2001

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, today I join 43 Members in introducing legislation to reauthorize and amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act (IHCIA)—the keystone federal law that directs the delivery of health services to American Indian and Alaska Native people.

The Indian health care network—comprised of reservation- and traditional homeland-based hospitals, clinics, school health centers and health stations in very remote areas, and urban Indian health programs in major cities—is the primary source of medical care for over 1.3 million American Indians and Alaska Natives. The Indian Health Service administers this comprehensive health care network largely in partnership with Indian tribes themselves who have assumed an increasingly greater role in operating health programs so vital to the well-being of their members.

The IHCIA was first enacted in 1976 to present a more organized and comprehensive approach to the delivery of medical care to Indian people, most of whom live in isolated, sparsely-populated and under-served areas of our country. Subsequent reauthorization, has amended the Act to reflect advancements in health care delivery, respond to the desire of tribes for greater responsibility of programs, and target the high incidence of certain diseases that have plagued this segment of the American population.

The bill we introduce today is based largely upon recommendations made by the Indian health community—including tribal leaders, tribal health directors, health care experts, Native patients themselves, and the Indian Health Service. Its primary objective is to improve access to quality medical care for this population.

In this bill we maintain the basic framework of the IHCIA, including its provisions that target diseases for which Indian Country shows an astonishingly high rate—such as diabetes, tuberculosis, infant mortality, and substance abuse. We have included a greater role for Indian tribes in setting local priorities for health care delivery and provide for innovative options for funding of Indian health facilities. This legislation authorizes a nationally certified Community Health Aide program to supply medical care in under-served, remote areas and strengthens health programs that serve Indian people in urban areas. In addition, this bill will provide for the consolidation of substance abuse, mental health and social service programs into a holistic system for behavioral health services.

We have certainly made improvements in the health status of Indian and Alaska Native people since IHCIA was first authorized including; infant mortality which has decreased by nearly 55 percent. Native people, however, still suffer death rates from some diseases at rates many times higher than the national population such as; diabetes at 249 percent higher, tuberculosis at 533 percent higher, and substance abuse at 627 percent higher.